

No. 0 05-954 JUN 27 2006

In The OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Supreme Court of the United States

PIPER JAFFRAY & CO., and
ROBERT ENGLISH, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

STEPHEN C. TOMAZICH,

Respondent.

**On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The Montana Supreme Court**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Counsel:

STANLEY T. KALECZYC
BROWNING, KALECZYC, BERRY
& HOVEN, P.C.
139 N. Last Chance Gulch
P.O. Box 1697
Helena, Montana 59624
(406) 443-6820

Counsel of Record

JOHN S. LUTZ
TAMARA A. HOFFBUHR
FAIRFIELD AND WOODS, P.C.
1700 Lincoln, Suite 2400
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 830-2400

*Counsel for Piper Jaffray & Co.,
and Robert English*

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether the Montana Supreme Court violates the Federal Arbitration Act through its judicially imposed requirement that pre-dispute arbitration clauses commonly contained within securities industry customer agreements must be explained to the customer *before the agreement is even executed*, which stands in direct conflict with the State Supreme Courts of Alabama, California, Ohio, and South Dakota?
2. Whether the Montana Supreme Court impermissibly interferes with the relationship between broker-dealers and their customers in violation of the Commerce Clause through its invalidation of pre-dispute arbitration clauses commonly contained within securities industry customer agreements, which practice comports with the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine but contradicts at least three U.S. Courts of Appeals and sixteen State Supreme Courts?

PARTIES

Petitioner Piper Jaffray & Co. ("Piper Jaffray"), defendant below, is a registered broker-dealer conducting business in all 50 states, including Montana. At all times material to this case Piper Jaffray conducted business at, among other locations, its Branch Office in Butte, Montana.

Petitioner Robert English, defendant below, was at all times material the Piper Jaffray Branch Office Manager in the Butte Branch.

Defendant Thomas J. O'Neill was at all times material the Piper Jaffray Account Executive for the Respondent.¹

The plaintiff below, Respondent here, filed a complaint in the underlying action focused strictly on alleged misconduct involving a Self Directed IRA Account.² In opening said account, Respondent signed a Self Directed IRA Account Agreement with Piper Jaffray containing a pre-dispute arbitration clause, typical of the clauses approved by the Securities regulators and used throughout the securities industry nationwide. Respondent was at all times material a citizen of Montana and maintained the account at issue with Piper Jaffray's Butte office.

¹ Mr. O'Neill is not represented with respect to this Petition.

² Respondent's underlying complaint may be found at App. 26-53.

RULE 29.1 LISTING

Piper Jaffray & Co. was formerly U.S. Bancorp Piper Jaffray Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of U.S. Bancorp. During the pendency of this litigation, the name and ownership of U.S. Bancorp Piper Jaffray Inc. changed in connection with the spin-off by U.S. Bancorp of its capital markets business on December 31, 2003. To effect the spin-off, U.S. Bancorp contributed its capital markets business, including U.S. Bancorp Piper Jaffray Inc., to a newly formed subsidiary, Piper Jaffray Companies, and subsequently distributed all of the shares of Piper Jaffray Companies to the shareholders of U.S. Bancorp. In connection with the spin-off, U.S. Bancorp Piper Jaffray Inc. changed its name to Piper Jaffray & Co. and became a wholly owned subsidiary of Piper Jaffray Companies, a publicly traded company whose shares are traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol "PJC."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.....	i
PARTIES	ii
RULE 29.1 LISTING.....	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
CITATIONS TO OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL RE- PORTS	1
JURISDICTION	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	7
Introduction	7
I. The Montana Supreme Court violates the Federal Arbitration Act and frustrates the na- tional policy of favoring arbitration as a means of dispute resolution through its unique judi- cially imposed requirement that pre-dispute arbitration clauses commonly contained in se- curities industry customer agreements must be explained to the customer before the agree- ment is even executed, which requirement is not applied to any other contract provisions in Montana, and is in direct conflict with deci- sions by four other State Supreme Courts.....	13

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
II. The Montana Supreme Court's wholesale invalidation of pre-dispute arbitration clauses common in the securities industry is out of step with at least three U.S. Courts of Appeal and sixteen State Supreme Courts which routinely enforce arbitration clauses contained within customer agreements in the securities industry, but in step with one decision from the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine, resulting in a split which must be reconciled in favor of enforceability to protect the national policy favoring arbitration.....	22
III. The Montana Supreme Court violates the Commerce Clause through its wholesale invalidation of pre-dispute arbitration provisions common in the securities industry which impermissibly interferes with the relationship between broker-dealers and their customers in interstate commerce	27
CONCLUSION	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>ABM Farms, Inc. v. Woods</i> , 692 N.E.2d 574 (Ohio 1998)	9, 20, 24
<i>Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson</i> , 513 U.S. 265 (1995)	8, 19
<i>American Ins. Co. v. Cazort</i> , 871 S.W.2d 575 (Ark. 1994)	24
<i>Barrett v. McDonald Investments</i> , 870 A.2d 146 (Me. 2005)	10, 11, 26
<i>Bender v. Smith Barney, Harris Upham & Co. Inc.</i> , 789 F.Supp. 155 (D.N.J. 1992)	20
<i>Benoay v. E.F. Hutton & Co. Inc.</i> , 699 F.Supp. 1523 (S.D. Fla. 1988)	20
<i>Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegna, et al.</i> , Case No. 04-1264	11, 12
<i>Camps Newfound/Owatonna, Inc. v. Town of Harrison, Maine, et al.</i> , 520 U.S. 564 (1997)	27
<i>Cantella & Co., Inc. v. Goodwin</i> , 924 S.W.2d 943 (Tex. 1996)	25
<i>Carlsten v. Oscar Gruss & Son, Inc.</i> , 853 A.2d 1191 (R.I. 2004)	25
<i>Casarotto v. Lombardi (Casarotto I)</i> , 268 Mont. 369, 886 P.2d 931 (1994)	7, 8, 23
<i>Casarotto v. Lombardi (Casarotto II)</i> , 274 Mont. 3, 901 P.2d 596 (1995)	8
<i>Chor v. Piper, Jaffray & Hopwood, Inc.</i> , 261 Mont. 143, 862 P.2d 26 (1993)	14, 18, 23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Continued

	Page
<i>Cohen v. Wedbush, Noble, Cooke, Inc.</i> , 841 F.2d 282 (9th Cir. 1988).....	23
<i>Curtis v. Newhard, Cook & Co., Inc.</i> , 725 F.Supp. 1072 (E.D.Mo. 1989).....	20
<i>David v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith, Inc.</i> , 440 N.W.2d 269 (N.D. 1989).....	25
<i>Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Shear</i> , 796 P.2d 296 (Okla. 1990)	25
<i>Dickler v. Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc.</i> , 596 A.2d 860 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1991).....	25
<i>Dinsmore v. Piper Jaffray</i> , 593 N.W.2d 41 (S.D. 1999)	9, 18, 25
<i>Doctor's Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto</i> , 517 U.S. 681 (1996).....	8, 15, 18
<i>Dowd v. First Omaha Securities Corp.</i> , 495 N.W.2d 36 (Neb. 1993).....	25
<i>Fairview Cemetery Assoc. v. Eckberg</i> , 385 N.W.2d 812 (Minn. 1986)	24
<i>Financial Network Investment Corp. v. Becker</i> , 741 N.Y.S.2d 837 (N.Y. Sup. 2002)	25
<i>Finkle and Ross v. A.G. Becker Paribas, Inc.</i> , 622 F.Supp. 1505 (S.D.N.Y. 1985)	23
<i>First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan</i> , 514 U.S. 938 (1995)	13
<i>Garmo v. Dean, Witter, Reynolds, Inc.</i> , 681 P.2d 253 (Wash. 1984)	25
<i>Gouger v. Bear, Stearns & Co., Inc.</i> , 823 F.Supp. 282 (E.D.Pa. 1993).....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Investment Management & Research, Inc. v. Hamilton</i> , 727 So.2d 71 (Ala. 1999).....	24
<i>Iwen v. U.S. West Direct</i> , 293 Mont. 512, 977 P.2d 989 (1999)	8
<i>H.P. Hood & Sons, Inc. v. Du Mond</i> , 336 U.S. 525 (1949)	28
<i>Jones v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith</i> , 604 So.2d 332 (Ala. 1991).....	9, 20, 24
<i>Keystone, Inc. v. Triad Systems Corp.</i> , 1998 MT 326, 292 Mont. 229, 971 P.2d 1240 (1998)	8
<i>Kingston v. Ameritrade, Inc.</i> , 302 Mont. 90, 12 P.3d 929 (2000)	8
<i>Kloss v. Edward D. Jones</i> , 2002 MT 129, 54 P.3d 1 (2002), cert. denied, 538 U.S. 956 (2003).....	9
<i>McKinney, In Re</i> , 167 S.W.3d 833 (Tex. 2005).....	21
<i>Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.</i> , 473 U.S. 614 (1985)	13
<i>Oppenheimer & Co., Inc. v. Young</i> , 475 So.2d 221 (Fla. 1985).....	24
<i>Passage v. Prudential-Bache Securities, Inc.</i> , 223 Mont. 60, 727 P.2d 1298 (1986)	23
<i>Perry v. Thomas</i> , 482 U.S. 483 (1987).....	14, 15
<i>Pierce County, Wash. v. Guillen</i> , 537 U.S. 129 (2003).....	27
<i>Pierson v. Dean, Witter, Reynolds, Inc.</i> , 742 F.2d 334 (7th Cir. 1984).....	10, 21, 24
<i>Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood & Conklin Mfg. Co.</i> , 388 U.S. 395 (1967)	11, 12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Prudential-Bache Securities, Inc. v. Stricklin</i> , 890 F.2d 704 (4th Cir. 1989).....	22
<i>Rosenthal v. Great Western Financial Securities Corp.</i> , 926 P.2d 1061 (Cal. 1996).....	9, 19, 21, 24, 26
<i>Rush v. Oppenheimer & Co. Inc.</i> , 681 F.Supp. 1045 (S.D.N.Y. 1988)	20
<i>Schlemmer v. North Central Life Co.</i> , 307 Mont. 203, 37 P.3d 63 (2001).....	17
<i>Securities Industry Ass'n v. Connolly</i> , 883 F.2d 1114 (1st Cir. 1989)	23
<i>Shearson/American Express, Inc. v. McMahon</i> , 482 U.S. 220 (1987)	14, 23
<i>Smith Barney, Inc. v. Henry</i> , 775 So.2d 722 (Miss. 2001)	24
<i>Southland Corp. v. Keating</i> , 465 U.S. 1 (1984).....	13
<i>State ex. rel. PaineWebber, Inc., v. Voorhees</i> , 891 S.W.2d 126 (Mo. 1995).....	25
<i>Threlkeld v. Metallgesellschaft Ltd.</i> , 923 F.2d 245 (2nd Cir. 1991).....	23
<i>United States v. Lopez</i> , 514 U.S. 549 (1995).....	27
<i>Vukasin v. D.A. Davidson & Co.</i> , 241 Mont. 126, 785 P.2d 713 (1990).....	14
<i>Wiley v. Iverson</i> , 295 Mont. 511, 985 P.2d 1176 (1999)	17
<i>Willems v. U.S. Bancorp Piper Jaffray Inc., et al.</i> , 2005 MT 37, 326 Mont. 103, 107 P.3d 465	1, 4, 7, 11, 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Wyoming v. Oklahoma</i> , 502 U.S. 437 (1992).....	27
<i>Zigrang v. U.S. Bancorp Piper Jaffray Inc., et al.</i> , 2005 MT 282, 107 P.3d 465	6
 U.S. CONSTITUTION	
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 3	1, 27
 STATUTES	
9 U.S.C. § 2.....	2, 15
15 U.S.C. § 78.....	22
26 U.S.C. § 408.....	6
Mont. Code Ann. § 28-2-906.....	17
 OTHER AUTHORITIES	
NASD Rule 3110.....	22
Scott J. Burnham, <i>The War Against Arbitration in 30 Montana</i> , 66 Mont. L. Rev. 139 (2005)	30

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioners respectfully petition for a Writ of Certiorari to review the judgment of the Supreme Court of Montana in the following case.

Citation to Official and Unofficial Reports:

Stephen C. Tomazich v. U.S. Bancorp Piper Jaffray Inc., et al., 2005 MT 243N, 120 P.3d 811 (App. 1-3).

This case relies upon and expressly adopts the holdings and analysis set forth in *Willem v. U.S. Bancorp Piper Jaffray Inc., et al.*, 2005 MT 37, 107 P.3d 465,³ which is one of twenty-three civil cases arising out of allegations of misconduct by Mr. O'Neill, Mr. English and Piper Jaffray with respect to the accounts of the respective plaintiffs.

JURISDICTION

The Montana Supreme Court rendered its decision on September 27, 2005. Justice O'Connor granted an extension of time up to and including January 27, 2006 to file the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Commerce Clause, U.S. Const., art. 1, § 8, cl. 3:

The Congress shall have the Power . . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

³ The *Willem* case has been settled and therefore no Petition is being filed with respect to that case.